U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U336S190038)
Reader #1:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		40	31
Adequacy of Resources			
1. Resources		20	15
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		20	17
	Sub Total	100	83
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority 1			
1. STEM/Computer Science		5	5
	Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority			
Invitational Priority			
1. Promise Zones		0	0
	Sub Total	0	0
	Total	105	88

Technical Review Form

Reader #1:   **********

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U336S190038)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

   (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

   (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

   (iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

   Strengths:

   -        The proposal articulates a partnership between three key institutions, UCLA, Centinela Valley Union High School District and ACCESS to develop the STEM+C^3 (e14). The model is based on previous 2009 and 2014 TQP awards (e24) and shifts the focus to look at adding computer science teacher development to the existing teacher residency model so that the funding structure can be refined and replicated in other areas of the nation. The focus on computer science is noted as a strength of the proposed partnership, as it seeks to take existing infrastructure from the previous proposal to sustain residency practices to improve computer science access for the community. The long-standing teacher residency program creates a strong foundational partnership (e24-e25).
   -        The research base is referenced throughout the narrative articulating the need for computer science in California (e45-e47). The proposal presents elements including the California state K-12 computer science plan, licensure pathways and impact on teacher education. The integration of these three elements is a noted strength of the proposal, recognizing the needs for teacher recruitment to meet the needs of the local community. This highlights how the project has successfully leveraged opportunities from policy, industry, and the education residency model to construct a comprehensive design to all elements of the teacher residency program.
   -        The proposal presents a key rationale that centers on the needs of the two main partners. Centinela Valley Union High School District has a teacher shortage in key STEM areas, and therefore the teacher residency model meets their needs to fill the key classrooms with highly qualified teachers to improve student outcomes (e40). The University of California Los Angeles is seeking opportunities to increase effective use of the Exploring Computer Science and Introduction to Data Science (e28). These two needs align directly with the teacher residency program proposal, which is a noted strength of the rationale for the proposal.
   -        The logic model presented aligns inputs with activities, and outcomes for both teachers and students (e55). The outcomes presented are clear about having measurable outcomes, which is a noted strength of the proposal.
   -        The proposal includes comprehensive elements that are specific to establishing a teacher residency program that is designed to meet the needs of the Centinela Valley Union High School District, as well as being able to inform the larger national community. The attention to training teachers for computer science related to the national Exploring Computer Science curriculum has the opportunity for replication and/or scaling and is a noted strength (e25).
   -        The proposed dissemination plan is robust with a focus on both practitioners as well as institutes of higher

education (e48-e49). The sharing of strategies increases the sustainability of the plan and demonstrates potential to impact the larger educational community.

Weaknesses:

-        Although the proposal has a stated intent for sustainability, it is not clear how the existing model would be sustained beyond the federal funding period. The previous awards leading to additional awards does not demonstrate a track record of capacity for the partner institutions. The proposal would benefit from additional details regarding financial sustainability beyond the grant period (e24, e59).

-        The proposal provides an intent to develop new pathways for training new STEM teachers related to computer science. However, the proposal does not clearly demonstrate the explicit new strategies that were innovative compared to the existing STEM teacher residency IMPACT program. The proposal would benefit from more detail regarding the specific strategies that will be implemented and investigated related to the key content areas listed (e25).

-        The proposal seeks to investigate the role of teacher residency related to STEM and computer science. These strategies have an existing research base that is robust, and the proposal does not clearly demonstrate how the project will be increasing our knowledge or understanding in these areas. The current proposal speaks to implementation of best practices and would benefit from additional focus on how the project will be increasing our knowledge (e25).

Reader's Score: 31

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.

   (ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

   Strengths:

-        The proposal presents the inclusion of facility and personnel resources from the partner institution through a budget justification table (e216-e223). Additionally, resources are addressed in the logic model inputs (e96). The resources presented are comprehensive and clearly align with the needs of the project. The resources are being used thoughtfully, leveraging existing infrastructure from the two previous TQP awards (e24).

-        The partners have included letters of support (e194-e201) from each of the partner institutions. Each letter outlines their commitment to the project with specific partner responsibilities, demonstrating their understanding of their commitment to the implementation and success of the project.

-        The engagement of community members from each of the partner organizations in the needs assessment to create the comprehensive solution is a noted strength of the proposal (e77-e78). Each of the partners have an investment and input into the project design, which demonstrates a commitment to the implementation and potential success of the project.

Weaknesses:

- The proposal requests a waiver from providing the matching funds that are required as a component of program (e94-e95). The lack of matching funds demonstrates a lack of resources from the lead organization, which negatively affects the adequacy of supports and creates a challenge for program execution and future sustainability of the project.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:**

   (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

   Strengths:

   - The proposal clearly presents a management plan that addresses activities, benchmarks, timeline, and responsibility related to each of the proposed goals and objectives (e55-e57). The actions align with the objectives and reasonable timeframe. The presented level of detail is a strong foundational path for the execution of the project toward the intended goals.
   - The organizational chart was noted as a strength of the proposal, specifically the inclusion of a blend of leadership from UCLA and Centinela Valley Union High School District. The representation of both partners in the leadership structure is a noted strength of the proposal (e59-e60).
   - The proposal clearly articulates how each of the elements will be executed with sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to improve practice among teacher residents. For example, in the training for computer science, the teachers will have the opportunity to engage in completing coursework that is specific to earning a California computer science teacher endorsement (e55-e57). In addition, the professional learning is sustained across the course of the year and involves experiential opportunities as well as time for reflection. This example highlights how the project has incorporated best practices to develop learning that is sufficient in duration and intensity to lead to change.
   - The University of California Los Angeles has a demonstrated record of accomplishment with previous grant implementation and evaluation (e24). The district outlines personnel and capacities that are adequate to support the proposed project.

   Weaknesses:

   - No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance

data on relevant outcomes.

(ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths:

-       The proposal presents an evaluation plan that meets the What Works Clearinghouse Design Standards with Reservation (e62, e64). The design includes both qualitative and quantitative data and seeks to evaluate both the teacher residency design as well as impact on student learning.
-       The proposal leverages the external evaluator for the two previous TQP awards, to also complete progress monitoring as well as performance feedback (e62-e63). The existing knowledge of the evaluator of the project structure, as well as the broad evaluation questions will benefit the execution of the teacher residency program, as well as providing feedback to improve teacher resident instruction.
-       The proposal presents a comprehensive narrative that outlines the measures and timeline associated with each of the measures across multiple aspects of the proposal. The narrative clearly demonstrates how multiple data sets will be used for analysis (e69).

Weaknesses:

-       The proposal does not clearly describe the methodology for establishing the matching groups that will be used for evaluation in the quasi-experimental matched study (e65). This methodology is key to the study and warrants additional details to establish if the process is rigorous to inform possible outcomes. Additionally, the proposal lacked information about the sample sizes that would be used in the evaluation process, as well as the effect size that was being used as a benchmark for success.

Reader's Score: 17

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science by increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.**

   Strengths:

-       The proposal for the STEM+C^3 (e14) is focused on developing both STEM teachers as well as computer science teachers to address the teacher shortage needs for Centinela Valley Union High School District (e40). The program is targeting these areas by providing teacher residents with strong content knowledge coursework through inquiry-based coursework to model appropriate pedagogy. The coursework will be available to both teacher residents and mentor teachers to allow more educators to benefit from the exposure to computer science, which was noted as a strength of the application.
-       The research base is referenced throughout the model and program elements (e34-e43). The proposal commits to recruitment of teacher residents who are traditionally underrepresented in computer science including women, individuals with disabilities, and minorities (e27). This is a strength as it aligns with the student population of the Los Angeles community to provide role models. The proposal presents elements including course of study, field experience seminars, field study and other components which further aligns with the CPP1 criteria.
-       UCLA is also committed to the implementation of the state of California's K-12 Computer Science plan within the

teacher residency model. This plan will support job opportunities and build support for more computer science opportunities (e24, e27).

Weaknesses:

\-   No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. **An applicant may address one or both of the following priority areas:**

   Propose to serve children or students who reside, or attend TQP project schools, in a qualified opportunity zone as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (Pub. L. 115-97). In addressing this priority, an applicant must provide the census tract number of the qualified opportunity zone for which it proposes to serve children or students and describe the extent to which the applicant will serve individuals in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s). OR

   Demonstrate in its application that it has received or will receive financial assistance from a qualified opportunity fund under section 1400Z-2 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, for a purpose directly related to its proposed project. In addressing this priority, an applicant must identify the qualified opportunity fund from which it has received or will receive financial assistance and describe the extent to which the applicant will use the financial assistance for its proposed project.

   Strengths:

   \-   Not addressed in this proposal.

   Weaknesses:

   \-   Not addressed in this proposal.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/14/2019 11:48 AM

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/14/2019 11:57 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U336S190038)
Reader #2:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		40	30
Adequacy of Resources			
1. Resources		20	15
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		20	17
	Sub Total	100	82
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority 1			
1. STEM/Computer Science		5	5
	Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority			
Invitational Priority			
1. Promise Zones		0	
	Sub Total	0	
	Total	105	87

Technical Review Form

Reader #2:   **********

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U336S190038)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

   (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

   (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

   (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

   (iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

   Strengths:
   •   While the grant is a program implementation grant, the proposal goes a step further by wishing to conduct research on the program they wish to create. Mention human subjects research under routine educational settings involving normal educational practices (e17)
   •   Given that this TQP grant specifically focuses on STEM and specifically Computer science, including CS in the proposal is a strength. (e19)
   •   This program not only includes coursework throughout the academic year, it Includes summer institutes that are enhanced programming for the students. (e31)
   •   Project design is described in detail explaining the explanations at each step (e55)

   Weaknesses:
   •   This proposal reads that the only change is the addition to computer science to an already existing STEM teacher residency program. The addition of CS to the existing programming is not substantial. (e34-38)
   •   This is a $5 million including federal and non-federal funds means it is taking over $200,000 to develop one teacher through this program. The program could provide the same service for more students to receive a stronger return on investment. The current value added per student is not justified.   (e23)
   •   The addition of computer science to an already existing program is not innovative (e34-38)

Reader's Score: 30

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following

factors:

(i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.

(ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

Strengths:

•   The given infrastructure of the program has been well established over several years, so this shows that it is a well-functioning program. (e24)
•   Resources from and networks with the districts are reliable due to their longevity (e30)
•   Center X, where this grant work would be held, already employs 300 educators and personnel. An infrastructure is already in place, so it does not need to be developed from the ground up. (e29)

Weaknesses:

•   The STEM c-3 director completes all duties as assigned at 30%, including the duties of this proposed grant. I do not see much buy-in with having so little of a time commitment for any person written into this grant. This is a weakness because the director's duties are less than 50% leading one to believe it might not be an absolute priority. An explanation of how this fits into their other duties could provide more clarity of how 30% is enough to serve as director for this grant. (e216)
•   Grant proposal requested 100% match. They are requesting a waiver. This grant does not seem to be sustainable after the grant is complete with this little buy-in to compete the match. (e94)

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:**

    (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

Strengths:

•   This organization has a well-oiled machine and they know how to manage a program like this. The Center through which this is being run has been around for 25 years. They have received multiple grants to continue their work of teacher preparation. (e 23-24, e55)
•   Proposal provides 3 strong goals: Designing/implementing STEM+C Teacher Training and mentor development (e28); developing computer science authorization Pathway for STEM Teachings (e34), Create a robust California Stem+C Community of Practice (e37) with a clear plan on how to achieve each goal. These goals are based on the needs of the state education system, and they proposal meets the needs of the state through these goals and with the potential outcomes. (e55-57)
•   Concise objectives, inputs, activities, objectives, short term/mid-term, and long-term goals are each concisely described in the flow chart. Their plan is detailed and all parties involved in the grant know their responsibilities. (e55)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

   (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

   Strengths:

   •   Evaluation method is multi-dimensional which provides multiple means of obtaining data and evidence for meeting outcomes. Includes quantitative and qualitative research methods (e64) that involves "the collection and/or analysis of multiple primary and secondary data sources to examine the [research questions] and outcomes of the STEM+C program." (e62)
   •   The evaluation method looks at success of students deeper than just completing the program. Evaluation of residency and student learning addressing outcomes of students taught along with persistence rates of the newly licensed teachers from the program. (e64-70)

   Weaknesses:

   •   The evaluation only focuses on the program and the students who will be going through the program (STEM+C). An evaluation piece is missing regarding the evaluation of the partnerships, or those who provide match and whether those relationships provide value to the program, whether the partnerships are internal or external. While the match is minimal, there is some match, and partnerships are part of this program to a point. Evaluating the partnerships that are in place would strengthen the evaluation as a whole, and it could potentially provide some insights for future grants in obtaining more buy-in. (E63-70)

Reader's Score: 17

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science by increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.**

   Strengths:

   •   Computer Science licensure is fairly new across the nation, but the state of California is adding it. This grant adds the computer science component that is being requested by the state within a program that is already established

and has a good opportunity for success because of this. (e34)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. **An applicant may address one or both of the following priority areas:**

   Propose to serve children or students who reside, or attend TQP project schools, in a qualified opportunity zone as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (Pub. L. 115-97). In addressing this priority, an applicant must provide the census tract number of the qualified opportunity zone for which it proposes to serve children or students and describe the extent to which the applicant will serve individuals in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s). OR

   Demonstrate in its application that it has received or will receive financial assistance from a qualified opportunity fund under section 1400Z-2 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, for a purpose directly related to its proposed project. In addressing this priority, an applicant must identify the qualified opportunity fund from which it has received or will receive financial assistance and describe the extent to which the applicant will use the financial assistance for its proposed project.

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/14/2019 11:57 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U336S190038)
Reader #3:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Selection Criteria			
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		40	32
Adequacy of Resources			
1. Resources		20	15
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Management Plan		20	20
Quality of the Project Evaluation			
1. Project Evaluation		20	18
	Sub Total	100	85
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority			
Competitive Preference Priority 1			
1. STEM/Computer Science		5	5
	Sub Total	5	5
Invitational Priority			
Invitational Priority			
1. Promise Zones		0	0
	Sub Total	0	0
	Total	105	90

Technical Review Form

Reader #3:   **********
Applicant: The Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (U336S190038)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)).

   (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

   (iii) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

   (iv) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach for meeting statutory purposes and requirements.

   Strengths:

   • The applicant presents a strong project design which the partners: the UCLA Center X, the Centinela Valley Union High School District (CVUHSD), and the Alliance for California Computing Education for Students presents a strong collaboration and partnership through offering rigorous curriculum in a 16-month program leading to a California Preliminary Teaching Credential in Math of Science, Computer Science and Masters in Education (pg. e23).

   • The applicant presents that the program, UCLA STEM+C3) builds upon the lessons learned and implementation of a previous project, IMPACT (pg. e23).

   • The applicant provides three goals that includes clear objectives, and outcomes, i.e., Design and Implement a Quality STEM+C Teacher Training and Mentor Teacher Development Program, Develop a Computer Science Authorization Pathway for STEM Teachers, and Create a Robust California STEM+C3 Community of Practice (pg. e 28-38).

   • The applicant presents a plan to disseminate the work of STEM+C3 to other programs throughout California and nationwide (pg. e49).

   Weaknesses:

   • The applicant is unclear in presenting a detailed plan in how it will build capacity after the period of financial funding has ended. It is limited in how it is expanding knowledge and current work in developing an innovative project. For example, detailing the project design of this initiative rather than an emphasis on previous initiatives (pg. e23-33).

   • The project does not provide substantial evidence of building capacity and yielding results after the period of Federal financial assistance. For example, the costs are high with the number of students served and it is vague in describing what will occur after the period of Federal financial assistance in providing the services (pg. e49-50).

Reader's Score: 32

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. **The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources for the proposed project. In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) The adequacy of support, including facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources, from the applicant organization or the lead applicant organization.

   (ii) The relevance and demonstrated commitment of each partner in the proposed project to the implementation and success of the project.

   Strengths:

   • The applicant presents a strong plan in detailing how resources will be provided to support the program (pg. e49-53). UCLA Center X provides strong resources that they will manage the residency program in collaboration with the Centinela Valley Union High School District (pg. e49).

   • The applicant details each partner's commitment for the implementation of the project, e.g., The Alliance for California Computing Education for Students and Schools, The Centinela Valley Union High School District, and UCLA Center X.

   Weaknesses:

   • The applicant does not provide a 100% match of the program. It is unclear how the program will be sustainable after the period of Federal funding (pg. e49-52).

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:**

   (i) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

   Strengths:

   • The applicant provides a comprehensive management plan that includes clear inputs, activities, objectives, short term goals, midterm goals, and long term goals (pg. e55). These goals corelate to each goal of the project. The applicant presents timelines and milestones that are clear. The applicant details a management plan that includes who is responsible for each objective and timeline (pg. e58). Having such a detailed and comprehensive management plan is highly likely that the project will be completed on time and within budget.

   Weaknesses:

   • No weakness noted.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (i) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes.

   (ii) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

   Strengths:

   • The applicant presents a detailed evaluation plan through providing that evaluations will be conducted by UCLA's National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST) who has over 50 years of experience (pg. e62).

   • The applicant cites a mixed method evaluation. The evaluation provides samples of evaluation questions, data sources, data collection frequency, and study samples (pg. e69).

   Weaknesses:

   • The details regarding the match group and methodology are not clear (pg. e64-65). Not having a clear methodology for the match group will result in the inability to establish the quasi-experimental matched study.

Reader's Score: 18

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1. **Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science by increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.**

   Strengths:

   • The applicant provides a project to improve student achievement in computer science increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including computer science, through recruitment, evidence-based professional development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields (pg. e23).

   Weaknesses:

   • None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Invitational Priority - Invitational Priority

1. **An applicant may address one or both of the following priority areas:**

   Propose to serve children or students who reside, or attend TQP project schools, in a qualified opportunity zone as designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (Pub. L. 115-97). In addressing this priority, an applicant must provide the census tract number of the qualified opportunity zone for which it proposes to serve children or students and describe the extent to which the applicant will serve individuals in the Qualified Opportunity Zone(s). OR

   Demonstrate in its application that it has received or will receive financial assistance from a qualified opportunity fund under section 1400Z-2 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, for a purpose directly related to its proposed project. In addressing this priority, an applicant must identify the qualified opportunity fund from which it has received or will receive financial assistance and describe the extent to which the applicant will use the financial assistance for its proposed project.

   Strengths:

   Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/14/2019 08:55 AM